

Reconciliation and Revival: Bishop Daniel Sandford of Edinburgh, 1766-1830

ELEANOR HARRIS

Introduction

Daniel Sandford, Bishop of Edinburgh from 1806 until his death in 1830, was one of the less showy figures of Regency Edinburgh. This reassessment reconstructs his roles first in reunification of the Scottish Episcopal Church, and second in the foundation of the Edinburgh Lancastrian Schools, the city's first step towards universal primary education. Both projects demonstrate Sandford's commitment to Enlightenment universalism: Episcopal union was regarded as a considerable personal risk, and Lancastrian education was a surprising collaboration with progressive Whigs and evangelical Presbyterians.¹ The third section of the paper uses these events, with Sandford's published writings and diocesan ministry, to explore his theology. Sandford combined episcopalianism with evangelical faith more successfully than many contemporaries. Accounts of Edinburgh's 'golden age' and of early Victorian religion have underestimated his significance and likely influence. His belief in the power of education made him the dedicated teacher of generations of young influential men and women whose spirituality was formed by Britain's first evangelical bishop.

¹ 'Edinburgh *Lancastrian* Schools' was how the founders labelled their project; '*Lancasterian* education' is the conventional modern spelling for the system.

Daniel Sandford, born 1 July 1766, was the second son of Daniel Sandford of Sandford Hall, Shropshire. His father was a clergyman in the Church of Ireland, but on his death in Daniel's infancy his mother brought the family from Dublin to Bath. Daniel studied at Christ Church Oxford, but his previous education and his formative vacations were dominated by bluestocking women: Mary Delany, the Duchess of Portland, Elizabeth Carter, Caroline Watson, Frances Bowdler, and his aunt Sarah Chapone. Sandford married Helen Douglas, daughter of a Scottish Jacobite, in 1790 and, as a curate in London, gained the notice of Bishop Beilby Porteus. Helen's relatives suggested a freelance career in Scotland might yield more success than navigating the networks of English patronage, so in 1792, aged 25, Sandford arrived in Edinburgh.² He took in pupils and began leading English Prayer Book worship on 13 April 1794, opening a chapel on 28 May 1797 at the West End of the New Town, adjacent to the yet-unbuilt Charlotte Square.³ Sandford's elegant English liturgy, warm spirituality, and scholarly preaching proved popular and his congregation grew rapidly. Having joined the Scottish Episcopal Church on 20 November 1804, Sandford was consecrated Bishop of Edinburgh on 9 February 1806.⁴ His congregation outgrew Charlotte Chapel and built St

² John Sandford, *Remains of the late Right Reverend Daniel Sandford, D.D. Oxon. Bishop of Edinburgh in the Scottish Episcopal Church; including Extracts from his Diary and Correspondence, and a Selection from his Unpublished Sermons. With a Memoir*, vol. I (Edinburgh, 1830), p. 24.

³ *Caledonian Mercury*, 16 August 1792, 5 April 1794.

⁴ Daniel Sandford's Subscription to the Articles of Union. National Records of Scotland (NRS) CH12/12/2138; Consecration of Daniel Sandford as Bishop of Edinburgh, NRS CH12/12/103.

John's, Princes Street (consecrated 19 March 1818), selling Charlotte Chapel to a Baptist congregation. Although hampered from this time by very poor health, Bishop Sandford ministered in St John's, assisted from 1826 by his curate and successor Edward Bannerman Ramsay, until his death in 1830.

This paper argues that Sandford was groundbreaking, influential, and worthy of detailed study. How is it that he has been so overlooked? The only modern dedicated study of his episcopacy, by Reginald Foskett in 1966, mentions his 'work of reconciliation' as important for the Scottish Episcopal Church, although the conclusion that Sandford was 'not a great scholar nor an outstanding bishop' ensured no subsequent researcher paid him much attention.⁵ Marion Lochhead the same year praised Sandford more highly for scholarship, piety, and in particular his support for 'the true Scots Episcopacy', but her account suffers from being impressionistic and partisan.⁶ In histories of Edinburgh, Sandford barely features, although his cameo role in Mary Cosh's *Edinburgh: The Golden Age* (2003) gives him more prominence than previous works.⁷ Sandford's commitment to tolerance and unity may well have resulted in his oblivion in a historiography interested in partisanship: he was one of a generation of theologians whose 'casual' attitude to denomination were, as Reginald Ward observed, 'quite opaque to historians writing from the standpoint of the contests of the 'thirties and 'forties, and have

⁵ Reginald Foskett, 'The Episcopate of Daniel Sandford 1810-1830', *Records of the Scottish Church History Society* 15 (1966), 141-52, p. 152.

⁶ Marion Lochhead, *Episcopal Scotland in the Nineteenth Century*, (London, 1966) p. 94.

⁷ Mary Cosh, *Edinburgh: The Golden Age* (Edinburgh, 2003) pp. 110, 474, 793.

remained opaque to writers who have followed them'.⁸ Most importantly, his son published the two-volume posthumous *Remains of the late Right Reverend Daniel Sandford* (1830), including a biography and selection of diary extracts, letters, and sermons. This apparently rich source achieved widespread circulation and appeared to contain everything historians needed to know about Sandford. However, the *via media* Anglican it depicts differed significantly from the far more radical Regency theologian who emerged from Sandford's own publications, and it appears likely that John deliberately intended to preserve his father's reputation in his non-evangelical circles by obscuring his more embarrassing theological traits.

If John Sandford did intend a cover-up, it was a spectacular success which recent historians have aided and abetted. Rowan Strong assumes that 'Calvinism formed the main paradigm for evangelicalism' in Scotland and was therefore the preserve of the Presbyterians.⁹ He also misreads George Grub's confusing account of bishops' correspondence in 1826, thinking that Sandford (not Bishop Gleig as Grub says) had called evangelicalism 'fanaticism', on which basis Strong labelled Sandford anti-evangelical.¹⁰ Patricia Meldrum cited evidence from a Calvinist in 1799 and a Tractarian in 1844 (before, and long after, Sandford's episcopate), to argue for a 'rather staid and formalised stance' in the Episcopal Church, awaiting

⁸ W. R. Ward, *Religion and Society in England, 1790-1850* (London, 1972), p. 4.

⁹ Rowan Strong, *Episcopalianism in Nineteenth-Century Scotland* (Oxford, 2002), p. 215.

¹⁰ Strong, *Episcopalianism*, p. 215; George Grub, *An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland, from the Introduction of Christianity to the Present Time*, vol. 4 (Edinburgh, 1861), p. 174.

‘more vibrant expressions of Christianity’.¹¹ The subtler understandings of English Regency theology, developed by scholars including Reginald Ward, Peter Nockles, Mark Smith, and Stephen Taylor has yet to penetrate Scottish Episcopalian historiography.¹² If this study of Sandford’s episcopacy achieves nothing else, it should put a stop to the persistent Scottish tendency to project Victorian church parties back into the period before 1830. By drawing on Sandford’s published sermons, unpublished letters, and newspaper reports, this paper reassesses his significance.

1804–6: Episcopal Union

Charlotte Chapel was the last Qualified Chapel to be founded in Edinburgh and the first to unite with the Scottish Episcopal Church, and Sandford’s involvement was decisive for the process of union. Since 1745, the Scottish Episcopal Church had suffered legal penalties on account of its Jacobite sympathies, but English or ‘Qualified’ Chapels gained exemption from penal legislation by appointing English-ordained clergy, using the English Prayer Book, refusing allegiance to Scottish Bishops, and praying for the Hanoverian monarchy. The influential laymen promoting the union, including banker Sir William Forbes, judge Alexander Fraser

¹¹ P. Meldrum, *Conscience and Compromise: Forgotten Evangelicals of Nineteenth-Century Scotland* (Cumbria, 2006), p. 6.

¹² Peter B. Nockles, ‘The Oxford Movement: Historical Background 1780-1833’ in Geoffrey Rowell, ed., *Tradition Renewed: The Oxford Movement Conference papers* (London, 1986), pp. 25-50; Peter B. Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context: Anglican High Churchmanship 1760-1857* (Cambridge, 1994); Mark Smith and Stephen Taylor, eds, *Evangelicalism in the Church of England c.1790-1890* (Suffolk, 2004).

Tytler, and Thomas Hay-Drummond, Earl of Kinnoull, were part of a cross-border circle of high church clergy and laity including Scottish Primus John Skinner, English playwright Richard Cumberland, the Bowdlers (Sandford's friends from Bath), Bishop Samuel Horsley, and English Hutchinsonians in the circle of William Stevens. Their work for repeal of the penal laws since the church renounced Jacobitism in 1788, and success in 1792, has been well documented.¹³ However, their plan to reunite the church by making English Hutchinsonian Jonathan Boucher a Scottish bishop collapsed in April 1794 for a variety of reasons including lack of English support and Boucher's reluctance to risk his English livings.¹⁴ Ted Luscombe's account of the final chapter in the story, by which the Synod of Laurencekirk in 1804 paved the way for union, presents Sandford as willingly uniting first, but Sandford's role was more decisive than he suggests.¹⁵ By the time the Boucher plan failed, the Edinburgh laity were already employing the young Oxford stylist Sandford to edit their writings, and it seems likely that by 1800 they had identified Sandford as a suitable alternative to Boucher.¹⁶ In July 1800 Tytler and

¹³ F. C. Mather, *High Church Prophet: Bishop Samuel Horsley (1733-1806) and the Caroline tradition in the Later Georgian Church* (Oxford, 1992) Robert M. Andrews, 'William Stevens (1732-1807): Lay Activism in Eighteenth-Century Anglican High Churchmanship' (PhD thesis, Murdoch University, 2012).

¹⁴ Jonathan Boucher to William Forbes, 5 April 1794, National Library of Scotland (NLS) Acc.4796/122.

¹⁵ Edward Luscombe, *Steps to Freedom* (Edinburgh, 2004) pp. 64, 66.

¹⁶ Richard Cumberland to William Forbes, 17 February 1794, NLS Acc.4796/21; Jonathan Boucher to William Forbes, 5 April 1794, NLS Acc.4796/122.

Sandford attempted to clarify the doubtful canon law status of English clergy who joined the Scottish Episcopal Church; and in August Kinnoull, too, 'had a full conversation with our respectable and worthy friend Mr Sandford on the subject of English & Scotch Episcopalians'.¹⁷ However, in Sandford's mind, the biggest barrier to union was not temporal but spiritual: the Scottish Episcopal Church had no written statement of faith, so English clergy had no guarantee of its orthodoxy. During the Synod of Laurencekirk, convened by Skinner on 24 October 1804, Sandford acted as consultant to ensure that the remedial measure, adoption of the Thirty-Nine Articles, was taken correctly. At a late stage, clergy who thought the Articles too Calvinist proposed adding a high church preface.¹⁸ Skinner turned to Sandford for assistance, who just in time sent a letter, 'very pertinent, & at great length ... reconciling us all ... to the propriety of subscribing the articles, just as the clergy of the Church of England do'.¹⁹ Sandford immediately addressed his congregation in a pamphlet explaining why union was now not only desirable but required, since 'CAUSELESS SEPARATIONS FROM A PURE CHURCH, is the sin of SCHISM, an offence, of which it is impossible that any pious and enlightened Christian can think lightly'.²⁰ His pamphlet was clear, forceful, and effective: 'my little paper has been received with the greatest good will. Not a dissenting voice have I heard', he wrote to

¹⁷ Thomas Hay-Drummond to William Forbes, 4 August 1800, NLS Acc.4796/26.

¹⁸ 1804 Oct 25. George Gleig to William Forbes NLS Acc.4796/31.

¹⁹ John Skinner to William Forbes, 26 October 1804, NLS Acc.4796/31.

²⁰ Daniel Sandford, *Pamphlet on Union*, NAS CH12/13/64, November 1804.

Skinner on 19 November, announcing just three weeks after Laurencekirk that Charlotte Chapel had joined the Scottish Episcopal Church.²¹ William Forbes received congratulations from Charles Daubeney calling Sandford 'the Harbinger to the Peace of the Church', while Bishop Skinner received congratulations from Bishop Porteus of London on the 'great acquisition' of his protégé Sandford.²² Daubeney, a high church English champion of Scottish Episcopalianism, was hostile to Porteus: they had recently crossed swords over Sunday schools.²³ Sandford's union, for a moment at least, genuinely reconciled antagonists, not only in Scotland, but across Britain.

Other English clergy, however, retained serious doubts. The legal position regarding cross-border pluralism remained hazy and Sandford sought to clarify the matter.²⁴ Yet spiritual difficulties also persisted. Scottish Episcopalianism was characterised by the anti-Newtonian theology of Hutchinsonianism, held by Primus John Skinner and many bishops and clergy. Hutchinsonianism, named after the Hebraist John Hutchinson (1674-1737), aimed to demolish the mechanical physics of Newton in favour of a providential alternative through the ambiguities of vowel points in the Hebrew Old Testament: the shared root of 'glory' and 'heavy',

²¹ Daniel Sandford to John Skinner, 19 November 1804, NRS CH12/12/2136.

²² Charles Daubeney to William Forbes, 24 December 1804, NLS Acc.4796/31; Beilby Porteus to John Skinner, 17 March 1806, NRS CH12/12/2142.

²³ Anne Stott, 'Hannah More and the Blagdon Controversy 1799-1802', in Smith and Taylor, eds, *Evangelicalism in the Church of England c.1790-1890* (Suffolk, 2004), pp. 1-9, p. 5.

²⁴ Daniel Sandford to George Winn, 9 January 1805, NRS CH12/14/70.

for example, suggested gravity was a phenomenon of the glory of God.²⁵ It was important, as Gavin White has shown, in extricating the church from Jacobitism, giving spiritual warmth to dry high churchmanship, and engaging the support of English Hutchinsonians who were instrumental in repealing the penal laws.²⁶ However, it was anti-Enlightenment: Robert Andrews's reassessment concludes that its 'reputation of being eccentric, obscurantist, and highly reactionary ... to a great extent was true'.²⁷ Skinner said Archibald Alison of the Cowgate Chapel 'still feels some difficulty' about union a year after Laurencekirk, and it seems likely that the prospect of submitting to an anti-Enlightenment college of bishops was the reason: Alison was one of Edinburgh's Enlightened literati.²⁸ In changing his mind, Alison was (Skinner reported) 'recommending ... the intended promotion of Dr Sandford'.²⁹ Skinner had in fact proposed Sandford as Bishop of Edinburgh as soon as he united, but there followed delicate negotiations to persuade the elderly Hutchinsonian Bishop Drummond to

²⁵ Robert M. Andrews, 'William Stevens (1732-1807): Lay Activism in Eighteenth-Century Anglican High Churchmanship' (PhD thesis, Murdoch University, 2012), p. 170.

²⁶ Gavin White, 'Hutchinsonianism in Eighteenth-Century Scotland', *RSCHS* 21 (1982), 157-69, pp. 165, 168; Gavin White, 'The Nine Lives of the Episcopal Cat: Changing Self-Images of the Scottish Episcopal Church', *RSCHS* 28 (1998), 78-92, p. 82.

²⁷ Andrews, 'William Stevens', p. 170.

²⁸ John Skinner to William Forbes, 14 November 1805, NLS Acc.4796/32.

²⁹ John Skinner to William Forbes, 18 December 1805, NLS Acc.4796/32.

retire in favour of an Enlightenment alternative.³⁰ Alison's decision to follow Sandford's lead in joining the Episcopal Church coincided with the issuing of a mandate to elect Drummond's successor.³¹ At Sandford's death Alison said, 'Let it be remembered that it is ... to ... Bishop Sandford, that the success of that great measure of the union of our churches is justly to be ascribed.'³² Sandford was no less committed to the Enlightenment than Alison: Alison's hesitancy demonstrates Sandford's courage in joining a church of dubious legality and theology; Alison's union demonstrates how, in two years, Sandford transformed its relationship to the Church of England.

Sandford's first act as bishop was to reach out another hand of friendship to the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. The young high churchman James Walker had made it clear when preaching at Sandford's consecration that this was not on the Episcopal agenda: the tendency for Presbyterians 'absurdly ... to found a new Religion' at every opportunity had severed them from apostolic succession.³³ Bishop Sandford delivered a very different message in his widely-read first *Charge* to his clergy: 'with regard ... to our Christian brethren of the Established Church', he said, 'if we cannot always "hold the

³⁰ See, for example, Daniel Sandford to John Skinner, 16 December 1805, NRS CH12/12/2141.

³¹ John Skinner to William Forbes, 10 December 1804, NLS Acc.4796/31.

³² Sandford, *Remains*, I, p. 54.

³³ James Walker, *The Condition and Duties of a Tolerated Church: a Sermon, Preached in Bishop Strachan's Chapel, Dundee, on Sunday the 9th February 1806; at the Consecration of the Right Rev Daniel Sandford, D.D. to the Office of a Bishop in the Scotch Episcopal Church* (Edinburgh, 1806), p. 32.

faith in the unity of the spirit,” (such is the imperfection of our nature,) we are not thereby entitled to break that “bond of peace”, which should be acknowledged by all who acknowledge Jesus Christ’.³⁴ Not only does Sandford twice emphasise in this sentence that Presbyterians are fellow Christians, but in blaming the schism on ‘the imperfection of *our* nature’ he suggests fault lies on both sides. Near the conclusion of his charge he chose a remark about integrity made by Henry Moncrieff-Wellwood, minister of the neighbouring parish church St Cuthbert’s, as one which ‘deserves our particular consideration’.³⁵ In this instance his son’s memoir rings true: ‘his politeness was ... the expression of benevolence, as well as of refinement’.³⁶ Beneath the stylist, there was a man prepared to make enormous personal commitments to the cause of reconciliation.

1810–13: Edinburgh Lancastrian Schools

In 1810 Sandford was one of the founding committee of the Edinburgh Lancastrian School Society, heading the list of Ordinary Directors alongside his Presbyterian neighbour Moncrieff-Wellwood. Sir William Forbes,³⁷ Professor Dugald Stewart, and Archibald Alison represented progressive Episcopalianism amongst the Extraordinary Directors, but it was Sandford who represented the Episcopal establishment and was on the working committee. The school opened in the

³⁴ Daniel Sandford, *Charge, Delivered to the Clergy of the Episcopal Communion of Edinburgh on Thursday the 15th January 1807* (Edinburgh, 1807), pp. 14–15.

³⁵ Sandford, *Charge*, p. 21.

³⁶ Sandford, *Remains*, I, p. 78.

³⁷ 7th Baronet, Son of Sir William Forbes, 6th Baronet, mentioned above, who died in 1806.

Lawnmarket in April 1811, and within a year built their own 'long, low, wood and brick erection' on Calton Hill.³⁸ Monitorial education was widely admired as a solution to illiteracy. However, its two chief promoters, Quaker Joseph Lancaster and Anglican Andrew Bell, had been driven into bitter competition when Anglican author Sarah Trimmer suggested Lancaster's non-denominational method threatened to undermine the Church of England, 'to which, as connected with the STATE, even her very enemies owe the protection of the laws of our excellent government'.³⁹ She also attacked Lancaster's degrading shame-based punishments, an element which caused some embarrassment to his supporters and condemnation from historians, but which were not intrinsic to the system and easily dispensed with in practice.⁴⁰ Moncrieff-Wellwood reported that the only punishments inflicted in the Edinburgh schools were twenty-minute detentions, and one expulsion in a case of 'obstinate disobedience'.⁴¹ The Whig Sydney Smith, who had been Sandford's assistant in Charlotte Chapel between 1798 and 1803, accused Mrs Trimmer of

³⁸ *Caledonian Mercury*, 1 April 1811; Henry Cockburn, *Memorials of his Time* (Edinburgh, 1909), p. 262.

³⁹ Sarah Trimmer, *A Comparative View of the New Plan of Education promulgated by Mr Joseph Lancaster ... and of the System of Christian Education founded by our Pious Forefathers for the Initiation of Young Members of the Established Church* (London, 1805), p. 14.

⁴⁰ Harold Silver, *The Concept of Popular Education* (London, 1965), p. 49; Eric Hopkins, *Childhood Transformed: Working-class Children in Nineteenth-century England* (Manchester, 1994), p. 135.

⁴¹ Henry Moncrieff-Wellwood, *A Sermon, Preached in St Andrew's Church, Edinburgh, for the Benefit of The Lancastrian School* (Edinburgh, 1812), p. 59.

‘defending what is right without judgement, and believing what is holy without charity’.⁴² Sarah Trimmer’s attack, and Sydney Smith’s scathing defence of the Lancastrian system, led to years of Whig and Tory bickering about who invented monitorial education first.⁴³ Yet the important ideological debate remained whether Lancaster’s children emerged enlightened or irreligious; whether Bell’s were humane or bigoted.

The Anglican Sandford might have been expected to agree with Sarah Trimmer. His first Bishop Beilby Porteus was strongly supportive of ecclesiastical establishment especially following the French Revolution: ‘we have seen ... the fatal consequences that have arisen to morals and to religion from ... dissolving the natural connection between the church and the state’, he told his clergy in 1803.⁴⁴ Yet Sandford had joined a *nonconformist* church, and anti-erastianism was the one element of Hutchinsonian theology which he wholeheartedly adopted. When he accepted a bishopric with no palace, patronage, political influence, stipend, or cathedral, he said, ‘it has often afforded me great satisfaction the resemblance that the Christian Society of which we are members, bears ... to the Church of Christ ... before the Conversion of the Emperor Constantine’, when bishops ‘were possessed of no other

⁴² Eleanor M. Harris, *Fervour and Frivolity: a Tale of Two English Gentlemen in Edinburgh* (Edinburgh, 2012); Sydney Smith, ‘Review of Sarah Trimmer’s “Comparative View”’, *Edinburgh Review* 9 (Oct. 1806), 177–183, p. 184.

⁴³ Henry Brougham, ‘Education of the Poor’, *Edinburgh Review* 17 (Nov. 1811); Robert Southey, *The Origin, Nature, and Object, of the New System of Education* (London, 1812).

⁴⁴ Beilby Porteus, *Works*, ed., Robert Hodgson, vol. VI (London, 1823), p. 303.

authority, and probably encompassed with no more outward dignity, than he who now addresses you.'⁴⁵ In the new West End, Sandford felt he was reviving the church from first principles, divested of worldly English prelacy, with the 'primitive' liturgy and polity of Irenaeus and Cyprian, but all the Enlightenment of the nineteenth century. Sandford came to believe that erastianism such as that of Bishop Porteus, in which 'the mode of church government is a matter of expediency alone' for maintaining social order, was a 'very dangerous doctrine, and much more likely to produce a careless indifference towards all religious persuasions, than a charitable judgement of those from whom opinions we may think it right to differ'.⁴⁶ Lancaster's system, steeped in scripture, but stripped of denominational trappings, fitted perfectly.

In Edinburgh the Bell-Lancaster debate took place between, on the one hand, dissenting Episcopalians, and 'Wild' evangelical Presbyterians who objected to landed patronage in the Kirk; and on the other, Episcopalians who considered themselves the rightful northern branch of the Church of England, allied with Presbyterian Moderates who held a similar view to Mrs Trimmer of the relationship between Church, State, and the maintenance of social order. As these rival ecclesiastical polities coincided with Whig and Tory political views, the Lancastrian Schools were, as another Ordinary Director Henry Cockburn said, 'the achievement of the whigs and of the pious', or in the words of their Tory opponent Walter Scott, 'the most vehement & rigid Calvinists in league with the Metaphysical school of the Edinburgh

⁴⁵ Sandford, *Charge*, pp. 10–11.

⁴⁶ Daniel Sandford, *Sermons Preached in St John's Chapel, Edinburgh* (Edinburgh, 1819), p. 501.

Review'.⁴⁷ This 'Whig-Wild' coalition had been seen in Edinburgh before. In 1805 the newly appointed Professor of Mathematics, John Leslie, was charged with atheism by Presbyterian Moderates, because his endorsement of Hume's Theory of Causation undermined their logical 'proofs' for the existence of God. Leslie and his supporters, Professors Dugald Stewart and John Playfair, were Whigs. Unexpectedly 'the supposed disciple of Hume' was defended by 'the whole evangelical clergy', whose faith was based on inner light rather than logical proof, and who defeated the Moderates by a narrow majority.⁴⁸ Cockburn maintained that in the Leslie affair, 'metaphysics had nothing to do with the matter ... Clerical domination over seats of learning was the real subject', a non-theological viewpoint reasserted by John Morrell, Michael Fry, and recently Charles Bradford Bow, who do not analyse the religious arguments in detail.⁴⁹ Yet the fact that the Whig Cockburn speaking of the Leslie affair, like the Tory Scott speaking of the Lancastrians, both accuse their opponents of impious motives (confusingly using 'metaphysical' in contradictory senses), surely suggests not that Edinburgh politics was irreligious, but rather that piety was considered crucial by both sides.

⁴⁷ Cockburn, *Memorials*, p. 262; Walter Scott, *Letters 1811–1814*, ed., H. J. D. Grierson, vol. 3 (London, 1932), p. 78.

⁴⁸ Cockburn, *Memorials*, p. 189.

⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 188; J.B. Morrell, 'The Leslie Affair: Careers, Kirk and Politics in Edinburgh in 1805', *Scottish Historical Review* 54 (1975), 63–82, p. 66; Michael Fry, *The Dundas Despotism* (Edinburgh, 1992), p. 297; C. B. Bow, 'In Defence of the Scottish Enlightenment: Dugald Stewart's Role in the 1805 John Leslie Affair', *Scottish Historical Review* 42.1 (2013), 123–146.

Understanding the interplay of religion and politics illuminates the way the Lancastrian debate played out in Edinburgh, and Sandford's role in it. A visiting Irish bishop, Thomas O'Beirne, attacked the schools in a sermon on 9 February 1812, praising the Scots by abusing the English, and concluding that Mr Lancaster's ultimate product was 'that modern monster, a female freethinker' of the kind which in France had 'levelled with the dust a throne which had existed for a thousand years'.⁵⁰ Cockburn said O'Beirne had been put up to it by 'some of the established clergy' and the 'Episcopalian illiberals'. The Tory Scott had the grace to seem embarrassed by this misogynist and racist (or, in Cockburn's words, 'insolent and ignorant') sermon, glossing over the 'very pleasant' O'Beirne and trying to make the 'furious attack' of Moncrieff-Wellwood, 'Pope of our Presbyterian divines', appear equally outrageous. 'We discharged Sir Harry at him', recalled Cockburn gleefully of the same event.⁵¹ Parallel scenarios play out again and again in Scott's historical novels, in which bigoted, backward attitudes are superseded by unanswerable enlightenment, but half-glimpsed yet infinitely precious values are in danger of being lost on the way, formulating a new Romantic Tory ideology which could provide a more satisfactory answer to the Whigs than O'Beirne. Meanwhile, the most striking aspect of Moncrieff-Wellwood's sermon, like Sandford's *Charge* of 1807, is its powerful defence of religious toleration. It was dedicated to Richard Watson, the Whig bishop of Llandaff, 'expressing the respect with which I have always regarded ... a Christian Bishop'. 'Different as the views of the most upright men may often be arising from their very different capacities and

⁵⁰ *Caledonian Mercury*, 10 February 1812.

⁵¹ Cockburn, *Memorials*, p. 262; Scott, *Letters 1811-1814*, p. 78.

attainments', Moncrieff-Wellwood wrote, 'their fidelity to their common Master requires them ... to acquire more perfect information, to surmount the prejudices which serve to divide them ... [and] to unite heartily in the things in which they are agreed'.⁵² Sandford and Moncrieff-Wellwood agreed that Protestant schism was the result of misunderstanding and toleration the sign of greater, not lesser, piety.

Bishop Sandford's wholehearted support for the Lancastrian Schools was significant: he rarely courted public attention. In April 1812 the Society held a dinner which Joseph Lancaster himself attended. In the toasting afterwards the leader of the Edinburgh Whigs, Francis Jeffrey, gave particular mention to 'the cordial support' of 'this liberal and enlightened clergyman'.⁵³ Sandford was not a partisan Whig or a champion of 'liberal' views as such: 'The spirit of spurious liberality is predominant', was his comment on Catholic Emancipation in 1828.⁵⁴ Along with his collaboration with Presbyterians and Quakers, this put Sandford in the opposite position to, for example, high churchman Bishop Samuel Horsley. Attitudes towards Catholic and Protestant dissent formed an early distinction between evangelical and high Anglican theologians.⁵⁵ In the eyes of the newspaper reporter, more significant than Jeffrey's toast was the 'modest' speech by the school's headmaster thanking Sandford for his 'unremitting attention'. 'It had been the regular practice of the Bishop', the headmaster said, 'to examine the children as to their proficiency in the church catechism [sic], whenever he visited

⁵² Moncrieff-Wellwood, *Lancastrian School*, pp. iv, 28.

⁵³ *Caledonian Mercury*, 13 April 1812.

⁵⁴ Sandford, *Remains*, I, p. 215; Mather, *Horsley*, p. 88.

the school'.⁵⁶ A bishop examining children on the Presbyterian catechism in a school founded by a Quaker: here was missionary religious toleration in action.

Cockburn and Scott's surprise at the 'Whig-Wild' coalition suggests how religious zeal equated to Covenanter and Jacobite tribal violence in Edinburgh minds. That Whigs and Tories both accused one another of impiety suggests that, despite this collective memory, religion was valuable to both. What strikes the modern religious historian is something contemporaries thought unworthy of remark: how many lay members of the Whig-Wild coalition were Episcopalian. Stewart almost became an episcopalian minister; Leslie saved Edinburgh's oldest Episcopal chapel, Old St Paul's, from closure; while Henry Cockburn was at this time having his numerous children baptised by Bishop Sandford.⁵⁷ That the 'Wild-Episcopalian' coalition was unremarkable on both occasions suggests that in early nineteenth-century Edinburgh, piety without tribalism had become possible thanks to a new shared spirituality of Enlightenment evangelicalism.

The Edinburgh Lancastrian Schools ran until they were superseded around 1840. For the Whigs it was an important victory, successfully engaging religion on their side and leaving the Tories backward looking. The Tories made their ideological comeback in the 1820s, critiquing the depersonalising tendency of the Whig utilitarian march of progress into the future. Scott led a Romantic Tory revival based on the humanising potential of history and identity. This

⁵⁶ *Caledonian Mercury*, 13 April 1812.

⁵⁷ James Holloway, *Old St Paul's: Three Centuries of a Scottish Church* (Edinburgh, 1989), p. 22; I. F. MacIver, 'Cockburn and the Church', in Alan Bell, ed., *Lord Cockburn, a Bicentenary Commemoration* (Edinburgh, 1979), pp. 68–103.

was the emotive ideological lens through which historian Thomas Markus described monitorial schools as 'great "moral steam engines"... Under the all-seeing eye of the master ... a clockwork hierarchy ... the utilitarian embodiment of Rousseau and Locke'.⁵⁸ Yet this was not at all how Sandford, preaching to raise funds in 1813, understood their value. He said that unlike one large, bored traditional class, the short lessons, small groups, and reward system infused even very basic education 'with entertainment and delight', and 'the attention of each individual pupil is constantly kept alive'. As for depersonalising children, Sandford made the opposite case: 'some one of these children ... may recount to his family around him, with grateful recollection, the benefits which he derived from your present bounty'.⁵⁹ Lancastrian education was not, in Sandford's opinion, hastening interdependent 'ranks' into conflicting 'classes', as Markus argues, but rather counteracting this process through the *repersonalising* force of paternalist charity.⁶⁰ In the very different economic and religious conditions of the 1830s and 40s, Whig, Tory, evangelical, and Episcopalian, stood for very different things. However, in the 1810s the Edinburgh Lancastrian Schools – an optimistic glimpse of social progress towards universal education, equal opportunity, and religious friendship – marked the high point of Sandford's ministry of reconciliation.

⁵⁸ T. A. Markus, 'Class and Classification in the Buildings of the Late Scottish Enlightenment', in Tom M. Devine, ed., *Improvement and Enlightenment* (Edinburgh, 1989), 78–107, p. 106.

⁵⁹ Daniel Sandford, *A Sermon, Preached in the Episcopal Chapel in the Cowgate, Edinburgh, on the 2d of March 1813; for the Benefit of the Schools under the Direction of the Lancastrian School Society* (Edinburgh, 1813), p. 17, 22.

⁶⁰ Markus, 'Class and Classification', p. 81.

An Episcopalian Evangelical

Daniel Sandford was evangelical. He has been assumed to have shared the theology of his first bishop, Beilby Porteus: Trinitarian Anglicanism enlightened by William Paley's natural and political theology; or else the non-Hutchinsonian high churchmanship of the Hackney Phalanx, shared by his Scottish colleagues George Gleig and James Walker.⁶¹ Yet Sandford's theology exhibits all four of the characteristics which David Bebbington identified as characterising Evangelicalism: emphasis on scripture, atonement, evangelism, activism, and conversion.⁶² Whereas the sermons of Porteus, Gleig, and Walker demonstrated what Nockles described as 'a certain declension towards chilliness', Sandford's evangelical preaching retained the spiritual warmth of the Hutchinsonians, but transformed by an outward-focused confidence in the Enlightenment.⁶³

Scripture dominates Sandford's sermons, with over 200 specific quotations in the two volumes he published in 1802, as well as many more unreferenced short quotes and phrases. Such scripture-infused writing was characteristic of evangelicals like Bishop Ryder of Gloucester, but in sharp contrast to Sandford's Edinburgh colleagues Archibald Alison and Sydney Smith, who preferred their own words.⁶⁴ It was

⁶¹ Nockles, *Oxford Movement in Context*, p. 204.

⁶² David W. Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: a History from the 1730s to the 1980s* (London, 1989), p. 3.

⁶³ Nockles, *Oxford Movement in Context*, p. 196.

⁶⁴ Mark Smith, 'Henry Ryder: A Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Gloucester in the Year 1816', in Smith and Taylor, eds, *Evangelicalism in the Church of England c.1790-1890* (Suffolk, 2004), pp. 53-85, pp. 67-8; Archibald Alison, *Sermons, Chiefly on*

not, however, unique to evangelicals: high churchmen such as Richard Mant refuting evangelical views of baptism would also pile up scriptural proofs and adopt biblical language.⁶⁵

Two of the four sets of sermons Sandford published were for Passion Week. In these the atonement was the doctrine he considered of prime importance. 'We come not hither, to recount and to lament the sufferings of an earthly benefactor, ... but to ponder over the atonement made for us by the SON OF GOD', he began his 1802 lectures.⁶⁶ 'The great atonement hath been now once offered', he concluded his 1821 lecture for Good Friday, adopting unexpectedly emotive language for an Oxford linguist: 'the transgressions of the world are expiated, and in CHRIST is our redemption sealed! ... O gracious and adorable Jesus, THE MESSIAH! ... thou hadst paid the debt, and ... in THEE is justification and eternal life'.⁶⁷ When Beilby Porteus preached on the atonement he maintained a scholarly detachment: 'We embrace, with gratitude and thankfulness, the great salvation offered to us by the death of Christ', he concludes, after forty pages addressing intellectual objections, 'and exert our utmost endeavours to ... liv[e] soberly,

Particular Occasions, vol. I (Edinburgh, 1820); Sydney Smith, *Six Sermons, Preached in Charlotte Chapel, Edinburgh*, vol. I (Edinburgh, 1800).

⁶⁵ Richard Mant, *Correct Notions of Regeneration and Conversion, According to the Sense of Holy Scripture and of the Church of England* (London, 1817).

⁶⁶ Daniel Sandford, *Lectures on the Epistles appointed for the service of the Church of England: on the days of Passion-Week, Easter-Even, and Easter-Sunday* (Edinburgh, 1802), p. 21.

⁶⁷ Daniel Sandford, *Lectures on the History of the Week of the Passion of our Blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ* (Edinburgh, 1821), p. 150.

righteously, and godly.’⁶⁸ Advising his clergy on preaching, Sandford warned against such sermons that founded moral living on ‘our endeavours’: ‘while he enforces the topics of religion by the aid of moral reasoning, let him above all remember, that “other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, namely Jesus Christ”’.⁶⁹ Like scripture, however, the atonement was a priority Sandford shared with high church theologians, particularly in his emphasis on the sacraments. Sandford took a Receptionist view of communion, explaining that the disciples at the institution were instructed to ‘commemorate a peace offering, and, by eating of the bread, to apply individually to themselves the benefits of a peace offering, in consequence of the atonement in His blood’.⁷⁰ Receptionism, Peter Nockles observes, was common to high church and evangelical theologians.⁷¹ The atonement focus gives Sandford’s theology its warmth, but not its distinctive evangelical flavour.

Sandford’s missionary impulse is evident in the contrast between his ministry and that of other English clergy in Edinburgh. Alexander Cleeve’s St George’s chapel remained small and elitist whereas Charlotte Chapel grew large, with high proportions of artisans and domestic servants, some of them English immigrants to Edinburgh’s developing economy. This reflected Sandford’s theology of equality around the communion table: ‘to make invidious distinctions ... between the rich and poor, is to forget that ye are engaged in acknowledging the pardon bestowed ... on those who are all

⁶⁸ Beilby Porteus, *Works*, III, pp. 25, 75.

⁶⁹ Sandford, *Charge*, pp. 19–20.

⁷⁰ Sandford, *Sermons in St John’s*, p. 419.

⁷¹ Nockles, *Oxford Movement in Context*, p. 237.

equally sinners'.⁷² Alison waited to join the Episcopal Church until it was safe, whereas Sandford took the risk, acting, his son said, against the advice of 'many of his friends' and especially his Oxford mentor Cyril Jackson. Sandford was practising what he preached: 'By your conduct ... you are to prove your adherence to the conditions upon which ... promises are made to you ... You are thus warned, that Christianity is an active profession', he told the young people he had just confirmed.⁷³ Mission for Sandford was linked with religious toleration: it was in collaborative activities like the Lancastrian Schools that Christians had the opportunity to 'instruct their fellow creatures in the things which may "make them wise unto salvation"'.⁷⁴ This distinguished Sandford from high church theologians such as James Walker in Scotland and Samuel Horsley in England, who regarded Apostolic Succession through bishops as essential to a true church.⁷⁵ Yet Sandford remained Episcopalian because he believed it to be not only the most scriptural form of church, but the form best-suited to mission. In 1818 St John's Chapel represented one of the first attempts to turn vernacular Episcopalian architecture to the service of the new heart-based faith by recreating an authentic Perpendicular interior, rejecting the practical auditorium which still characterised most neo-gothic churches in favour of high nave, long aisle,

⁷² Sandford, *Epistles for Passion-Week*, p. 110.

⁷³ Daniel Sandford, *An Address to Young Persons after Confirmation: Delivered at a Confirmation holden in Charlotte Chapel, Edinburgh, on Thursday March 30 1809* (Edinburgh, 1809) p. 6.

⁷⁴ Sandford, *Lancastrian School*, p. 8.

⁷⁵ Mather, *Horsley*, p. 88; Nockles, *Oxford Movement in Context*, p. 26.

slender piers, and fan-vaulted ceiling not adopted elsewhere until the 1820s.⁷⁶ For Sandford, a composite gothic pillar with fan vaulting, such as those adorning St John's, was an emotional object: 'extremely beautiful', he wrote of one in Wells Cathedral chapter house.⁷⁷ The one outside Christ Church hall, he said, 'dwells upon my recollection as an object of especial beauty'.⁷⁸ As well as architecture, the congregation's hearts would be moved by light from the great stained-glass east window in front of them, and music from the choir in the gallery behind. 'Good music has a prodigious effect in filling a church', Sydney Smith said in 1800. 'Of what value, it may be asked, are auditors, who come there from such motives? But our first business seems to be, to bring them there from any motive ... those who come for pleasure, may remain for prayer'.⁷⁹ Unfortunately, the state of stained-glass technology and Scottish church music was so poor that both these elements of Sandford's vision were failures, but the vision was retained and made St John's a major contributor to the revival of both arts in Edinburgh, founding a choir school in 1838, and converting its large windows to stained glass between 1857 and 1861.⁸⁰ While mission based on music and architecture later came to characterise Tractarian rather than evangelical religion, the Oxford Movement did not occur until after Sandford's death. However, it is right to see Sandford as part of a continual dissemination and development of religious ideas which had little respect for party distinctions. Tractarian

⁷⁶ Diane M. Watters, *St John's Episcopal Church Edinburgh* (Edinburgh, 2008), p. 16.

⁷⁷ Sandford, *Remains*, I, p. 128.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 295.

⁷⁹ Smith, *Six Sermons*, p. xxx.

⁸⁰ Watters, *St John's*, p.30.

thinking owed much to evangelicals like Sandford, and Sandford's emphasis on sacrament, liturgy, and tradition owed much to high church theology. It is no coincidence that the decision to build St John's chapel was made a few months after the appearance of *Waverley*, and that James White puts Scott's novels first amongst the key texts of the ecclesiastical Gothic revival.⁸¹ Sandford's evangelical Episcopalianism was in fundamental respects the religious equivalent of Scott's Romantic Toryism.

The most important theological challenge to episcopalianism by evangelicals regarded conversion. It was in this debate that Sandford's theology was distinguished most clearly from that of his high church contemporaries, although, as in the other debates in this narrative, there were no two clear parties, but several positions which formed alliances. Living a converted life was central to Sandford's theology: 'to reap the fruits of ... baptism, we must be careful to shew that our conversion is not merely external and formal', he preached in 1802.⁸² Yet he found himself in opposition to Anglican evangelicals experiencing, as he respectfully put it, 'the difficulty they feel to believe that Regeneration is the effect of Baptism'.⁸³ How could this episcopal doctrine square with the evangelical requirement for personal conversion? Richard Mant supplied the statement of Anglican orthodoxy (Sandford recommended it as such), stressing the uncertainty of knowing when regeneration took place if not at baptism.⁸⁴ Mant defined

⁸¹ James F. White, *The Cambridge Movement: The Ecclesiologists and the Gothic Revival* (Cambridge, 1962), p. 9.

⁸² Sandford, *Epistles for Passion-Week*, p. 157.

⁸³ Daniel Sandford to Alexander Jolly, 30 August 1816, NRS CH12/30/115.

⁸⁴ Sandford, *Sermons in St John's*, p. 520.

'conversion' as the 'rational conviction of sin ... sincere penitence and sorrow ... real change of heart and life ... and a resolute perseverance in well-doing'.⁸⁵ Henry Ryder, evangelical Bishop of Gloucester, took a different view. Ryder also distinguished regeneration and conversion, and agreed that baptism conferred some kind of benefit termed regeneration, but he denied that to be regenerate was to have 'entered upon the right path'.⁸⁶ Conversion was the moment for Ryder in which the journey began, essential in the life of every Christian: 'I would solemnly protest against that most serious error ... of contemplating all the individuals of a baptised congregation as converted [...] Ministerial addresses founded upon it soothe and delude the people into a false peace.'⁸⁷ Ryder clung to Anglican orthodoxy, but only by reducing regeneration to a preliminary formality.

Sandford rejected Ryder's enervated concept of regeneration and, like Mant, affirmed baptism as the moment of full entry to Christianity. Even in stating his orthodoxy, however, Sandford's emphasis on participation in the atonement was far more evangelical than Mant's intellectual demonstration: 'Instead of "children of wrath," we are made children of that dispensation which assures us of grace and mercy through the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ'.⁸⁸ Yet Sandford equally rejected Mant's downgrading of conversion to a rehabilitation process for the seriously

⁸⁵ Mant, *Regeneration and Conversion*, p. 57.

⁸⁶ Henry Ryder, 'A Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Gloucester in the Year 1816', in Smith and Taylor, eds, *Evangelicalism in the Church of England c.1790-1890* (Suffolk, 2004), pp. 87-107, p. 96.

⁸⁷ Ryder, 'Charge', p. 97.

⁸⁸ Sandford, *Sermons in St John's*, p. 382.

reprobate: 'as Methodists err', Mant said, 'by multiplying the subjects, of conversion: they err no less in respect of the rapidity, with which it is to be effected'.⁸⁹ On the contrary, Sandford said, although 'in some happy cases ... "the child of light" may have proceeded without deviation from the straight path', living a 'converted life' without an adult conversion, for 'by far the greatest number, the conversion from sin to holiness ... may have been as distinguishable and evident as it is indispensable'. Whereas Mant scorned, Sandford admired evangelical accounts of conversion, 'of which it is not to be doubted that there are many examples', and which he described in terms consistent with his belief that 'in all it is the same spirit which accompanied "the washing of regeneration" at the commencement'.⁹⁰ A person was converted not by Mant's 'resolute perseverance', but when:

in humiliation and contrition he seeks for pardon and grace, through that name to which he was dedicated in baptism; his prayer is heard; the flame which was not utterly stifled ... is again kindled by the breath of Heaven, and he arises from his fall, with increased diffidence in himself, and more abundant desire to trust in the Hand that has mercifully renewed him.⁹¹

Sandford was not the first to elaborate this position. He shared it with another, younger, Anglican evangelical, John Bird Sumner, who would become the first evangelical Archbishop of Canterbury in 1848. Sandford recommended Sumner's *Apostolical Preaching Considered* as 'one of the most useful

⁸⁹ Mant, *Regeneration and Conversion*, pp. 57, 66.

⁹⁰ Sandford, *Sermons in St John's*, p. 404.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 401–2.

treatises that have lately been given to the public'.⁹² In his first edition in 1815, Sumner only treated regeneration in a brief and vague footnote which David Bebbington interpreted as 'a shaky answer, a sign that evangelicals found this apparent discrepancy between their doctrine and their liturgy embarrassing'.⁹³ This charge could well be levelled at Ryder's compromise. However, in later editions from 1817, Sumner added a new chapter dealing specifically with regeneration. Sumner, like Sandford, argued that 'those who are devoted to Christ as infants by baptism, are regenerate, ie. are "accepted of God in the Beloved"'.⁹⁴ Sumner, like Sandford, gave conversion far more prominence than Mant: 'many who have once been pronounced regenerate, have afterwards entirely apostatized ... till they are brought back ... by some strong conviction of sin ... which may be definitively fixed and exactly traced'. Sumner, like Sandford, disagreed with Ryder that a conversion experience was invariably necessary: 'surely it will not be denied that some ... have never thrown off that yoke ... laid upon them at their baptism', and he cautioned that 'they who have really too much reason to rejoice, would be alarmed with unnecessary fears' by an insistence that 'some new creation, must take place in every heart'.⁹⁵

Sandford and Sumner were both conscious of treading a fine line on a controversial issue. 'I know and lament them deeply', Sandford said of the polarised opinions being aired, fearing they produced 'unwarrantable dejection' or 'spiritual pride'. He acknowledged it was difficult to understand the

⁹² Ibid., p. 522.

⁹³ Bebbington, *Evangelicalism*, p. 9.

⁹⁴ John Bird Sumner, *Apostolic Preaching Considered in an Examination of St Paul's Epistles*, 2nd edn (London), pp. 163–4.

⁹⁵ Sumner, *Apostolic Preaching*, pp. 165, 166–7.

Bible's apparently contradictory demands: 'We refuse not to admit infants to this holy rite, because we dare not disobey the Lord "who hath commanded the little children to be brought unto him"'. Defending episcopalian custom he wrote: 'we believe firmly, that Almighty God doth in mercy impute to them the qualifications', and in confirmation, 'provide them with an opportunity of making the profession in the most solemn and public manner'.⁹⁶ Both Sandford and Sumner gave the impression of reconciling a challenging question to their own satisfaction, not of struggling to patch up an awkward discrepancy, as Ryder appears to do. While their arguments might not satisfy evangelicals who denied baptismal regeneration, they were rare amongst Regency theologians in successfully having their episcopalian cake and evangelically eating it.

When lines were drawn, Sandford refused to play: 'I have nothing to do with party. I shall ever love and reverence true piety, whether I find it in the pages of the Christian Observer or the British Critic'.⁹⁷ His theological position appeared beyond the comprehension of his colleagues: 'he certainly gave too much countenance to the follies of evangelism; but he has ... seen his errors', was the closest Bishop Gleig came to understanding it.⁹⁸ Yet other Anglican evangelicals, such as Henry Venn, whom Sandford admired, also celebrated episcopalian practices and abhorred schism.⁹⁹ Sandford

⁹⁶ Sandford, *Sermons in St John's*, p. 397, 384–5.

⁹⁷ John Sandford, *Remains*, II, p. 8.

⁹⁸ George Gleig to Patrick Torry, 10 November 1820, NRS CH12/12/2366.

⁹⁹ Grayson Carter, *Anglican Evangelicals: Protestant Secessions from the Via Media c.1800-1850* (Oxford, 2001), p. 14; Sandford, *Remains*, I, p. 366.

regarded the Episcopal Church as the divine instrument for evangelical mission, the best church for the best theology. In his symbolic first sermon in St John's he applied his linguistic expertise to demonstrate that the definite article '*the* prayers' showed that liturgy, 'prescribed devotions, ... offered up "with one accord"', was biblical.¹⁰⁰ His Passion Week lectures show how he regarded the episcopal year as focusing on the atonement, with Wednesday and Friday services during Lent and every day in Passion Week forming a liturgical crescendo to the crucifixion. The same was true of the sacraments: communion was 'to commemorate a sacrifice of the atonement', while baptism 'is a figure of our resemblance to our blessed Lord: as he was buried, and rose again'.¹⁰¹ Such activities were designed to precipitate the crisis of a conversion: 'May the duties of this holy week, the contemplations in which it has engaged us ... awaken us if we have been betrayed into the slumber of carnal affections, and of carnal lives!'.¹⁰² Mission, while it should involve Protestant collaboration, was best achieved through the experience of Episcopalian worship. Fan vaulting, filtered sunlight, and counterpoint, along with sacrament, preaching, and liturgy, opened the heart to Christ.

Sandford's theology shows a close philosophical alignment to the developments in Edinburgh's Enlightenment through the incidents which created the 'Whig-Wild' coalition discussed above. Sandford's Passion Week lectures were primarily narrative rather than argumentative (suggested by the 1821 title of *History*), inviting listeners to participate in the story: 'we have attended our blessed Lord ... [to] his death', he

¹⁰⁰ Sandford, *Sermons in St John's*, p. 496.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p. 481; Sandford, *Epistles for Passion-Week*, p. 157.

¹⁰² Sandford, *History of the Passion*, p. 182.

began on Holy Saturday; 'this day, we commemorate his burial; we assemble ourselves to call to mind the solemn interval ... and perhaps we may be able, faintly, to represent to ourselves the feelings which occupied the minds of his disciples'.¹⁰³ Beilby Porteus taught his hearers to extrapolate their love for God from love of an admirable person: 'our friend and benefactor, our parent, guardian, protector, and governor, all in one', only mentioning the atonement amongst a long list of divine 'gifts'.¹⁰⁴ For Sandford, love for God was qualitatively unique, springing from the contemplation of the crucified, divine Christ, resulting inevitably in an active response:

Christians! no words can express the mingled emotions with which you should read the history of your Saviour's passion. For you, the blessed Son of God submitted to all the indignities and cruelties.... May the sentiments of unspeakable obligation, of admiration, of devotion, which the recital of them must raise within you, urge you to those returns of obedience, which are 'your reasonable service'.¹⁰⁵

Evangelical religion was the theological result of the intellectual shift observed in the Leslie case: amongst those who were happy to endorse Hume's Theory of Causation, the meaning of faith shifted from rational belief to heartfelt trust, or what Sandford called 'confidence'; and the focus of scholarly enquiry shifted from logic to history.¹⁰⁶ Porteus'

¹⁰³ Sandford, *Epistles for Passion-Week*, pp. 145-6.

¹⁰⁴ Beilby Porteus, *Works*, II, p. 9.

¹⁰⁵ Sandford, *Epistles for Passion-Week*, pp. 75-6.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 109.

arguments sought to satisfy his hearers' intellects; Sandford's narratives to engage their hearts.

Two events in Sandford's ministry appear to cast doubt on his evangelical credentials. In 1816, he was the first Scottish bishop to raise the alarm about 'unsound doctrines, which under the assumed disguise of Evangelical principles, are spreading Error through the Church of England'; and in 1826, when an evangelical minister in his diocese accused a senior clergyman of 'unsound and dangerous doctrine', Sandford said, 'That such accusations cannot be silently submitted to by ... the Episcopal College, appears undeniable'.¹⁰⁷ This second incident in particular has caused historians to regard Sandford as anti-evangelical.¹⁰⁸ Yet Sandford does not demonstrate any hostility to evangelical theology as such.

The 1816 incident was the 'Western Schism' in which, Sandford reported, 'four Clergymen of the Church of England ... have withdrawn from her Communion'.¹⁰⁹ Whereas many clergy might think this a good riddance, it was loyal Anglican evangelicals, such as Henry Ryder, who were the fiercest critics of the seceders, so Sandford's alarm tends rather to confirm his evangelical sympathies than otherwise.¹¹⁰ One issue was predestinarian Calvinism which caused, as Sandford said, 'offence at some parts of the Burial office'.¹¹¹ Ryder and

¹⁰⁷ Daniel Sandford to Alexander Jolly, 30 August 1816, NRS CH12/30/115; Daniel Sandford to Patrick Torry, 4 April 1826 in J.M. Neale, *The Life and Times of Patrick Torry, D.D., Bishop of Saint Andrew's, Dunkeld, and Dimblane* (London, 1856), p. 44.

¹⁰⁸ Strong, *Episcopalianism*, p. 215; Meldrum, *Conscience and Compromise*, p. 203.

¹⁰⁹ Sandford to Jolly, 30 August 1816.

¹¹⁰ Carter, *Anglican Evangelicals*, p. 106.

¹¹¹ Sandford to Jolly, 30 August 1816.

Sumner both wrote at length against predestination, while Sandford suggested Scottish bishops' understanding of Presbyterianism might help them refute it intelligently.¹¹² Unfortunately, Sandford's sympathetic and nuanced understanding of Presbyterian theology was not shared by most Scottish Episcopal clergy: Bishop George Gleig, for example, became so fixated by a horror of Calvinist influences that in 1819 he cavalierly dispensed with Original Sin:

Few members of our church, I believe, admit this incomprehensible doctrine ... taught in ... England, by that party which arrogates to itself exclusively the merit of evangelical preaching, and which ... is now daily employed in sending missionaries among us to enlighten the natives of Scotland!¹¹³

Gleig was no Highland Hutchinsonian, but nor was he a latitudinarian sceptic: he was an anglicising high churchman. His prioritisation of episcopalian exclusivity over orthodox theology highlights Sandford's unusualness in regarding episcopacy as the means to the end of preaching sacred doctrine, not doctrine as the means to uphold sacred episcopacy. Although Gleig continued to understand the entire evangelical movement as a Calvinist 'torrent, which threatens to overwhelm us', Sandford, Sumner, and Ryder realised that regeneration, not predestination, was the most challenging

¹¹² Smith, 'Henry Ryder', p. 60; Sumner, *Apostolic Preaching*, p. iv; Sandford to Jolly, 30 August 1816.

¹¹³ George Gleig, *Observations on Some of the Characteristic Doctrines of the Gospel: A Charge to the Clergy of Brechin* (Edinburgh, 1819), pp. 18–19.

issue raised by the schismatics, resulting in their carefully-articulated views.¹¹⁴

The 1826 Edinburgh controversy was the culmination of events which began in the winter of 1817–18, when an evangelical Englishman, Gerard Noel, preached in Sandford's chapel. Noel said nothing incompatible with Sandford's theology, although he adopted the warning tone absent from Sandford's sermons of one who, like Ryder, addressed the potentially unregenerate.¹¹⁵ Noel must have been preaching with Sandford's permission, and it might have been a homecoming. He had received some education in Edinburgh where it is probable Sandford was amongst his teachers: Sydney Smith said there were few alternatives for tutoring and Sandford's catechism class was the best option for a fashionable English youth of evangelical inclinations.¹¹⁶ Noel was a friend of Smith's pupil William Hicks-Beach, of whom

¹¹⁴ George Gleig to Patrick Torry, 10 November 1820, NRS CH12/12/2366.

¹¹⁵ Meldrum, *Conscience and Compromise*, p. 15; Gerard T. Noel, *The Nature and Objects of Christian Charity: a Sermon, Delivered at Charlotte Episcopal Chapel, on December 12. 1817, for the Benefit of the Senior Female Society* (Edinburgh, 1818); Gerard T. Noel, *The Gospel a Revelation of Mercy to the Guilty: a Sermon Delivered in Charlotte Episcopal Chapel, on January 22, 1818; for the Benefit of the Magdalene Asylum* (Edinburgh, 1818); Gerard T. Noel, *The Counsel of God the only True Wisdom: a Sermon, Preached in Charlotte Episcopal Chapel, on February, 19, 1818, for the Benefit of the Edinburgh Gratis Sabbath Schools*, (Edinburgh, 1818).

¹¹⁶ Sydney Smith to Mrs Beach, 2 January 1801. transcribed by Alan Bell.

Smith approved.¹¹⁷ Noel introduced an evangelical from London, Edward Craig. Craig became Rector of Old St Paul's in the Old Town from 1818 before moving his congregation in 1821 (as Archibald Alison had done a few years earlier) to a new chapel in the New Town, St James Broughton Place, where the congregation also established a school. Far from the younger generation of evangelicals in Edinburgh having to 'brave the hostility' of Sandford, it seems more likely that he invited and fostered them.¹¹⁸

Sandford's guileless generosity left him poorly armed against the disingenuousness or violence of others. His reconciliation depended on his own willingness to make personal, even sacrificial, commitments. As a young clergyman his pupils misbehaved 'out of doors', and as an old bishop he retained a scandalous and lazy organist for ten years, hoping he would reform.¹¹⁹ It is perhaps no surprise he created a situation which a less naive bishop might have guessed would cause controversy. Craig began preaching against baptismal regeneration. In June 1825 James Walker published his indignation in a visitation sermon, preached in St John's, lamenting how 'all who maintain baptismal regeneration are denounced as mere formalists, as pestilent heretics, as absolute Papists'.¹²⁰ Craig took his response into print to correct

¹¹⁷ Sydney Smith to Mrs Beach, February 1802 and 12 January 1803, transcribed by Alan Bell.

¹¹⁸ Strong, *Episcopalianism*, p. 215.

¹¹⁹ Sydney Smith to Mrs Beach, 2 January 1801, transcribed by Alan Bell; Eleanor M. Harris, *In Talent of the First Rank: In Inclination Totally Deficient: John Mather, 1781-1850* (Edinburgh, 2012).

¹²⁰ James Walker, *The Gospel Commission, its Import, its Obligations, and its Influence in the Commencement and Conduct of the Christian Life: Considered, in a Sermon Preached in St John's*

Walker's 'fearfully unsound and delusive ... doctrine respecting Baptism' and the debate degenerated into personal insults.¹²¹ Sandford did not censure Craig's doctrine, an error he considered dangerous rather than fatal: 'I am very far from supposing, or insinuating, that all who deny the regeneration of baptism desire to support the cause of fanaticism', he had once preached.¹²² Rather, Sandford's concern was Craig's accusation of 'a ruinous dearth of evangelical teaching' in the diocese, an 'injury ... in the sight and opinion of the world' which could not be overlooked.¹²³ Sandford refused to discipline Craig, instead sending all the clergy a reminder of the orthodox doctrine on regeneration and complaining privately to his daughter about Walker's 'furious philippic against all fanatics and bigots.... Alas! we are always accusing one another'.¹²⁴ Walker meanwhile called Sandford 'timid'.¹²⁵ Had Sandford's health not been extremely poor for most of the 1820s he might have been more active in seeking to reconcile two viewpoints he did not believe should be opposed: the debate festered beyond his death until eventual schism in the 1840s. However, Sandford had kept the church united, no

Episcopal Chapel, before the Bishop and Clergy of the Episcopal Communion in Edinburgh; on Wednesday, June 22. 1825 (Edinburgh, 1826), p. 22.

¹²¹ Edward Craig, *A Respectful Remonstrance, Addressed to the Rev James Walker* (Edinburgh, 1826), p. 4.

¹²² Sandford, *Sermons in St John's*, pp. 446–7.

¹²³ Daniel Sandford to Patrick Torry, 4 April 1826 in Neale, *Patrick Torry*, p. 44.

¹²⁴ Daniel Sandford to Frances Sandford, 30 December 1825, in Sandford, *Remains*, I, p. 27.

¹²⁵ James Walker to Patrick Torry, 22 May 1826 in Neale, *Patrick Torry*, p. 144.

mean feat given the rest of the eighteenth and nineteenth century Scottish ecclesiastical record.

Conclusion

How Sandford might have responded, had he lived beyond 1830, to developments like the Oxford Movement or the Gorham Controversy, can only remain matters of speculation. Yet, far from being backward or conventional, Edinburgh's bishop was the religious manifestation of its vibrant cultural 'golden age'. His reconciliation of enlightenment method, evangelical theology, and episcopalian ecclesiology was perhaps more successful than any of his contemporaries. His originality stemmed partly from his unique context of Bath, Oxford, and Scottish Episcopacy. It also stemmed from his character: his precision, integrity, and generosity. He was able to make a great deal out of small opportunities: building a flourishing congregation from scratch, bringing it into an ancient church, trebling the number of clergy in his diocese, collaborating with Presbyterians and Whigs, and demonstrating, in a society where religious war had bred religious reticence, that piety did not necessarily equate to fanaticism.

Sandford's influence was as an educator. 'There is no office ... by which you may ... do more real and lasting good', he told his clergy. 'I speak from long experience, that there is no duty required of us, which is more delightful ... We must ... ascertain that they understand what they say ... advancing in the nurture and admonition of the Lord'.¹²⁶ Sandford remembered the children he catechised, stayed in touch with many, and addressed several of his published works to young

¹²⁶ Sandford, *Charge*, p. 20.

people.¹²⁷ His influence is to be sought in the many Edinburgh-educated and globally-influential Victorians: MPs George Winn and William Forbes MacKenzie, missionary bishop Charles MacKenzie, and lay theologians William Stroud and Thomas Erskine were almost certainly influenced by Sandford, and there are likely to be many more. Due to Sandford's dislike of public notice, his children's desire to downplay his evangelicalism, and partisan historians' neglect, biographers have been unaware of his or significance and therefore unable to interpret references to his name or infer his influence: during the twentieth century St John's congregation moved his memorial out of sight during refurbishments, a forgotten worthy. This study of a long-lived, dedicated, and unique teacher might therefore be of value as a key to understanding many early Victorian minds.

People who met Sandford called him a 'saint', but his name was forgotten.¹²⁸ This reassessment argues that his reputation should rest on more than a saintly air or the modest achievements – a fine chapel, revived diocese, and briefly unified church – credited to him by the most generous of his previous biographers. His bold commitment to reconciliation was in contrast to the caution of more famous names like Boucher and Alison, and drew controversialist opponents, such as Porteus and Daubeney, into positions of unity. In the face of his colleagues' public opposition, he brought the weight of Episcopalian wealth and influence behind the 'Whig-Wild' Lancastrian Schools project, which until the 1840s formed a

¹²⁷ Sandford, *Remains*, II, p. 7; Sandford, *Remains*, I, p. 202.

¹²⁸ Anne Grant, *Memoir and Correspondence of Mrs Grant of Laggan*, ed., J.P. Grant, 3 vols (London, 1845), III, p. 172; J. H. Jaquet, *In Memoriam: A Sermon Preached in St George's Church, Wrotham on the Death of the Rev. Canon Lane* (London, 1879) p. 7.

significant component of its popular education in Edinburgh. Most importantly, over thirty years of preaching, Sandford's evangelical theology, at the forefront of the Enlightenment project, remained consistent in the face of changing circumstances and controversies. He demonstrated that there was nothing incompatible about piety and Enlightenment, evangelicalism and Episcopalianism. Sandford suffered from a reputation of being neither one thing nor another: this paper argues he was successfully both. The flourishing of Episcopalianism in early-nineteenth-century Edinburgh was the fruit of the ministry of reconciliation and revival of an evangelical bishop.

University of Stirling

